



April 19, 2001

Mr. James G. Nolan
Supervising Attorney
Legal Department - Information Release
Texas Workforce Commission
101 East 15th Street
Austin, Texas 78778-0001

OR2001-1570

Dear Mr. Nolan:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 146233.

The Texas Workforce Commission (the "commission") received a request for "a piece of information from the Glenn Bostic file concerning the threats he made to management," as well as "what ever [sic] is permitted by law from the file of Mr. Leyman and Cassie Carlson Reed." As to the first category of information sought, you assert that information responsive to that request is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. You inform us that the commission asked for a clarification from the requestor as to the second category of information sought, and that as of the date of your request for a ruling to this office, the requestor had not responded.

With regard to the second category of information for which you sought clarification, it is well-established that a governmental body may not disregard a request for records made pursuant to the Public Information Act merely because a requestor does not specify the exact documents desired. A governmental body must make a good faith effort to relate a request to information held by it. Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8-9 (1990), 87 (1975). Section 552.222(b) of the Government Code, however, provides that if a governmental body is unable to determine the nature of the records being sought, it may ask the requestor to clarify the request so that the desired records may be identified. This office has previously held that a request "must sufficiently identify the information requested and an agency may ask for a clarification if it cannot reasonably understand a particular request." Open Records Decision Nos. 663 at 4 (1999), 23 at 1-2 (1974); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 304 (1982) (governmental body sought clarification as to particular documents sought when requestor asked for all documents relating to particular issue).

Similarly, section 552.222(b) also provides that “[i]f a large amount of information has been requested, the governmental body may discuss with the requestor how the scope of a request might be narrowed” However, section 552.222(b) does not stand for the proposition that a request may be denied merely because it seeks a broad range of documents. The purpose of this section is to authorize a dialogue between the governmental body and the requestor regarding the scope of the records request.¹ ORD 663. When a requestor makes a vague or broad request, the governmental body should make a good faith effort to advise the requestor of the type of documents available so that the requestor may narrow or clarify the request. *See id.* at 5. On the other hand, if the requestor chooses not to narrow a broad request, the governmental body must release all responsive information if no exception to disclosure applies.

With regard to the information you have submitted to this office, we note that the Seventy-sixth Legislature amended section 552.022 of the Government Code to make certain information expressly public, and therefore not subject to discretionary exceptions to disclosure. Section 552.022 now states in relevant part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and are not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law.

Gov’t Code § 552.022. One such category of expressly public information under section 552.022 is “a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by [s]ection 552.108” Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information contained in Exhibit D is a completed report made for the commission. Therefore, as prescribed by section 552.022, the submitted report must be released to the requestor unless it is confidential under other law.

You argue that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure in its entirety under section 552.103, and that portions of the information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101. Section 552.103 is a discretionary exception and not “other law” for purposes of section 552.022.² Therefore, the commission may not withhold the submitted

¹Section 552.222(b) also limits the nature of the inquiries by the governmental body to those regarding the requested documents themselves. This section prohibits the governmental body from inquiring into the purpose for which the requestor seeks the records.

²Discretionary exceptions are intended to protect only the interests of the governmental body, as distinct from exceptions which are intended to protect information deemed confidential by law or the interests of third parties. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 4 (1994) (governmental body may waive attorney-client privilege, section 552.107(1)), 592 at 8 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.104, information relating to competition or bidding), 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). Discretionary exceptions therefore do not constitute “other law” that makes information confidential.

information under section 552.103. Section 552.101, however, excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrines of common law and constitutional privacy. Common law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. 540 S.W.2d at 683.

Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)).

This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under constitutional or common law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), information concerning the intimate relations between individuals and their family members, *see* Open Records Decision No. 470 (1987), and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). We have marked certain information within the document submitted as Exhibit D that is protected under common law privacy and which must therefore be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101.

We also note that section 552.101 excepts information made confidential by other statutes, such as Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (the "ADA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 *et seq.* The ADA provides that information about the medical conditions and medical histories of applicants or employees must be 1) collected and maintained on separate forms, 2) kept in separate medical files, and 3) treated as a confidential medical record. In addition, information obtained in the course of a "fitness for duty examination," conducted

to determine whether an employee is still able to perform the essential functions of his job, is to be treated as a confidential medical record. 29 C.F.R. § 1630.14(c). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 641 (1996). The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the "EEOC") has determined that medical information for the purposes of the ADA includes, "specific information about an individual's disability and related functional limitations, as well as general statements that an individual has a disability or that an ADA reasonable accommodation has been provided for a particular individual." *See* Letter from Ellen J. Vargyas, Legal Counsel, EEOC, to Barry Kearney, Associate General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, 3 (Oct. 1, 1997). We conclude that the information you have highlighted in Exhibit D must be withheld from the requestor under section 552.101 and the ADA.

To summarize, because we find that the submitted information is a completed report for purposes of section 552.022, you may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103. You must, however, withhold the information we have marked under common law privacy and section 552.101, as well as the information you have highlighted under the ADA.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Michael A. Pearle".

Michael A. Pearle
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MAP/seg

Ref: ID# 146233

Encl. Submitted documents

cc: Mr. Jose Santana
1122 Tetbury Lane
Austin, Texas 78748
(w/o enclosures)